Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,423	HANSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jiping Lu	3743	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on t	he cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 02 November 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	CATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
 W The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sam application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11 	1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
	ction, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
MONTHS OF THE FINAL RELECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension as under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thre ray reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70(b).	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL C The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance w filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the	reof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or	for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspo NOTE:, (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	nding number of finally rejected claims.
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See and the seed of t	ection applied to cliams 8 and 13.
non-allowable claim(s). To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will now the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided belt. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 19-29 and 31-34. Claim(s) objected to: 8 and 13. Claim(s) rejected: 1-7.9-12 and 14-16. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
Draw affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficie was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and wa 	all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the 	status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. Mathematical The request for reconsideration has been considered but because:	does NOT place the application in condition for allowance
See Continuation Sheet.	
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB 13. Other: Note the attached PTO-892. 	/08) Paper No(s)
	Jiping Lu/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3743

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowence because: Brandvold clearly teaches introducing additional air through an opening in a vall of the rotary vessel at a botion downstream relative to a kiln gas stream of the fame. There is no difference between the claimed combustion air and cooling air of Brandvold. The air used for cooling purpose would inherently perform combustion function and therefore is utilized as combustion air at same time (see patents itseld in the attached PTC-98) naminer also disagrees that Baukal, Jr. et al. teaches away from the claimed invention because Baukal, Jr. et al. is used for the teaching of introducing combustion air and combustible tell in a sub-solicinimetric ratio for reducing the amount of NOx produced. Baukal teaches the neeff of injecting additional air into the flame. Baukal does not teach that the failure of injecting additional air into the flame would render the invention inoperable and the amount of NOx would not be reduced if additional air is not injected into the flame.